DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 070 CS 213 154

AUTHOR Mouritzen, Gaye S.
TITLE Increasing Understanding of Right and Wrong in Relation to Cheating through the Curriculum of High School English Classes.
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 90p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Practicum Papers (043)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cheating; Educational Research; *English Instruction; *Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; High Risk Students; High Schools; High School Students; *Moral Values; Plagiarism; *Values Education

ABSTRACT

A practicum was designed to deal with the problem of cheating in a public alternative high school for at-risk students. Questionnaires completed by the teachers and the student body indicated that students had a deficiency in understanding and applying principles of accepted right and wrong to situations involving the possibility of cheating. Major goals were that students comprehend the principles and motives that underlie behavior in such situations, learn strategies for use in making moral decisions, understand what plagiarism is, and become familiar with research methods by which to avoid it. The solution created was a 12-week teaching unit for the writer's English classes. The unit consisted of three branches: branch 1 involved the reading of literature with related work; branch 2 dealt with the study and application of moral issues and strategies; and branch 3 covered research work and the comprehension of plagiarism. Literacy selections were used to introduce the subjects of honesty and dishonesty and their results; discussion groups dealt with what was happening and what should be happening. Results indicated that, while the practicum's major goals were only partially achieved, the practicum was a start toward seeing what can be accomplished in the field of moral studies through the English curriculum. Results showed that the three branches offer sensible methodology for dealing with the issues of right and wrong and are worthwhile as part of an English curriculum. (Three appendixes--questionnaires, the attitude toward cheating scale, and the pre/posttest--and 45 references are attached.) (PRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341070

Increasing Understanding of Right and Wrong in Relation to Cheating Through the Curriculum of High School English Classes

by

Gaye S. Mouritzen

Cluster XXXVIII

A Practicum I Report presented to the
Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Education

NOVA UNIVERSITY

1992

CS213154

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gaye S Mouritzen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRACTICUM APPROVAL SHEET

This practicum took place as described.

Verifier: Andrea L Loring

Ms. Andrea Loring

Assistant Principal

Title

Academy for Community Education
39 Zamora Avenue
Coral Gables, FL 33134

Address

1-29-92

Date

This practicum report was submitted by Gaye S. Mouritzen under the direction of the advisor listed below. It was submitted to the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education at Nova University.

Approved:

1-15-92

Date of Final Approval of Report

Robert Heppler

Dr. Robert J. Heppler

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The planning, preparation, and implementation of this practicum called for the encouragement and cooperation of a number of people. Thanks go to them for all their help.

To my husband Wayne for his special support, understanding, and care.

To Donna, my daughter, for prodding me on and coming to my rescue in difficult times.

To my mother, with her constant faith in me and her repeated reminder that "You can do it."

To the school administration for their interest and confidence.

To the "morning group" who encouraged me and helped me maintain some sanity.

To my students who worked through the implementation with me, making practicum completion possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....iv

ABSTRACT.....vi

Chapter

I INTRODUCTION 1

Description of Work Setting and Community..... 1
Writer's Role and Responsibilities..... 3

II STUDY OF THE PROBLEM..... 5

Problem Description..... 5
Problem Documentation..... 7
Causative Analysis.....11
Relationship of the Problem to the Literature.16

III ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS.....20

Goals and Expectations.....20
Behavioral Objectives.....21
Measurement of Objectives.....22

IV SOLUTION STRATEGY.....24

Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions.....24
Description of Selected Solution.....33
Report of Action Taken.....36

V RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....46

Results.....46
Discussion.....52
Recommendations.....55
Dissemination.....59

REFERENCES.....63

Appendices

A QUESTIONNAIRES.....68
B ATTITUDE TOWARD CHEATING SCALE.....77
C PRE/POSTTEST.....79

ABSTRACT

Increasing Understanding of Right and Wrong in Relation to Cheating Through the Curriculum of High School English Classes. Mouritzen, Gaye S., 1992: Practicum I Report, Nova University, Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies. Descriptors:English/Language Arts/Curriculum/Instruction/ Student Development/Moral Education/Honesty/Cheating/At-Risk/Secondary Education

This practicum was designed to deal with the problem of cheating in the public alternative high school which was the work setting. Questionnaires, designed by the writer and completed by the teachers and the student body, indicated that students had a deficiency in understanding and applying principles of accepted right and wrong to situations involving the possibility of cheating. Major goals were that students comprehend the principles and motives that underlie behavior in such situations, learn strategies for use in making moral decisions, understand what plagiarism is, and become familiar with research methods by which to avoid it.

The solution created was a twelve-week teaching unit for the writer's English classes. The unit consisted of three branches: Branch one involved the reading of literature with related work; branch two dealt with the study and application of moral issues and strategies; and branch three contained research work and the comprehension of plagiarism. Literary selections were used to introduce the subjects of honesty and dishonesty and their results; discussion groups dealt with what was happening and what should be happening. The study of research methods as a way to avoid plagiarism included a trip to a research library.

The practicum was a start toward seeing what can be accomplished in the field of moral studies, particularly in in regard to cheating, through the English curriculum. Time was a limiting factor; in order to change engrained habits, a longer implementation period is needed. The three branches offer sensible methodology for dealing with the issues of right and wrong and are worthwhile as part of an English curriculum; they do require fuller development over a longer period of time.

Permission Statement

As a student in the Ed.D. Program in Child and Youth Studies, I do (X) do not ( ) give permission to Nova University to distribute copies of this practicum report on request from interested individuals. It is my understanding that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination except to cover the costs of microfiching, handling, and mailing of the materials.

1-26-92 (date)

Gaye S. Mauritzen (signature)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Description of Work Setting and Community

A public alternative high school was the work setting for the practicum. The students enrolled were considered at-risk because of their academic and/or behavioral problems in the traditional schools they had attended. The general prerequisites for admission were poor attitude, poor school behavior, and/or lack of academic success due to poor motivation. Students were not officially assigned to the school; they came at their own or their parents' initiative or at the suggestion of their school principal or counselor. They were enrolled only after a student-parent interview and could be dismissed if their progress did not demonstrate their intent to improve.

Students living anywhere in this south-eastern United States county were permitted to attend; therefore, the school community encompassed the whole county, which made up one of the largest school systems in the United States.

Because of the geographic span, the socioeconomic background and the ethnic makeup of the school were varied, with the low and middle socioeconomic levels being more heavily represented. The school population reflected the makeup of the community with near-equal numbers of black, white, and Hispanic students. The degree of parental involvement differed greatly because some parents were very concerned and wished to work with the school to help their children as much as possible, while other parents were unconcerned or unable to help and were possibly part of the problem. Parental backgrounds also varied widely, from parents who had dropped out themselves to those who were college-educated and professionally employed.

The students were actually enrolled in the ninth through the twelfth grades, but the school was homogeneously grouped according to the learning ability of the students, rather than according to grade level. There were six homogeneous groups with group six being the highest academically. The daily schedule contained three ninety-minute periods followed by a sixty-minute activity period for subjects such as art and physical education. The schedule for each day was different because teachers met their groups two or three times a week in relation to the number of credits involved.

The school fluctuated somewhat in enrollment due to the type of students, but it held a fairly steady base, ranging

from about 120 to 140 students. The faculty/staff was composed of the director, the assistant principal, seven certified teachers, two teaching staff, a counselor, and five secretarial and support staff. The guidance office, headed by the counselor, was the heart of the teacher support system in relation to discipline, with strong backing by the administrators. One main principle in the establishment of the school was that at-risk young people need more structure and supervision, not less, to help them succeed.

Writer's Role and Responsibilities

The writer held the position of English teacher and taught groups one, five, and six. She had one to three ninety-minute classes per day interspersed with planning time. She was responsible for selecting the course content within the state and county frameworks and planning the daily classes. It was necessary for class periods to be structured so that the ninety minutes were used wisely and did not become tiresome; therefore, choosing more than one teaching method and/or learning strategy for use within the period was extremely important. Included in the restructuring of the school was the priority for teachers to

particularly emphasize critical thinking strategies in their classroom procedures.

An English curriculum is very inclusive: Literature, vocabulary, composition, speaking, debate, and discussion are among its components. The responsibility of the teacher was the utilization of the subject matter and the diverse curriculum elements in addressing the problem of this practicum.

CHAPTER II

STUDY OF THE PROBLEM

Problem Description

Students in the school did not demonstrate an active understanding of right and wrong in regard to dishonesty, especially cheating. Dishonesty was a serious problem, the results of which were observed in different student behaviors. Teachers were aware of how easily some students engaged in lying or in not telling the whole truth when the truth was inconvenient or uncomfortable for them. Stealing created difficulty for both teachers and students in keeping pens, pencils, or paper for daily use. Situations in which larger personal belongings or money were stolen had been documented through the work of the guidance office and the school police officer. Dishonesty, demonstrated through cheating on tests and in the copying of homework and classwork papers, was possibly the most frustrating on a continuing basis to the classroom teacher. To the English teacher and other teachers who required reports, the use of

plagiarism was an annoying extension of the problem of cheating.

In the ideal projection of a school or a classroom, students would respect the property of others enough not to steal, would speak the truth, and would do their own work, using their best abilities to learn. However, reality was not so perfect, and dishonesty was an unwelcome fact of school life.

Cheating is the most upsetting symptom of dishonesty from the academic point of view because, in making the choice to cheat, the student turns his thought processes from how to learn whatever subject matter or skill is involved to how to avoid being caught. Students who choose to cheat also have an affect on the classroom tenor, damaging what might have been an open, trusting atmosphere conducive to interaction. They exert an influence on the attitude and actions of the teacher and serve as a negative example to other students.

Cheating can become so common that it may be more acceptable to cheat than to be honest; this seemed to be true in many cases at this high school, making it very difficult to solve the problem. Peer attitudes were extremely influential on teenagers and very hard for school personnel or other adults to counteract.

It is also true, in situations involving moral issues, that those seeking answers quite often endeavor to work from

the outside in, dealing with symptoms and manifestations rather than with the core of the problem. The literature (e.g., Factor, McKeen, & Morris, 1990; Houston, 1986; Moss, 1984; Raffeto, 1985) had much to say about how to prevent cheating by seating arrangements, multiple tests, etc., but it was much harder to find ideas about procedures for working on personal attitudes, beliefs, and principles. These facets of an individual are more elusive than his outward actions and present quite a dilemma when one wishes to bring about change.

For these and other reasons, the problem of cheating continued to exist in the school despite the desire on the part of teachers, administrators, and some students for a situation closer to the ideal. Questionnaires completed by both students and teachers indicated that students in English classes had a deficiency in understanding and applying principles of accepted right and wrong to situations involving the possibility of cheating.

Problem Documentation

Evidence of the problem was established by the use of two questionnaires composed by the writer (see Appendix A), one for the student body and one for the teachers. The student questionnaire was administered to all classes during

the same class session, with the exception of a few make-ups. A total of 107 students completed a questionnaire. Exact directions from the writer (see Appendix A) were read aloud by each proctor. Students were instructed not to sign their names, and proctors were asked to follow procedures to insure privacy in answering. The student questionnaire consisted of 60 questions requiring yes/no responses, three open-ended questions, and one rating choice.

When asked if they had cheated in any of 17 ways, students answered with 55% affirmative answers. On question one, asking if they had copied someone's homework and handed it in, the answers were 86% affirmative, and on the question about letting someone copy their homework, the percentage was 91% affirmative. 72% of the students marked yes when asked if they had looked at someone's test for answers, and 64% said yes to copying information from an encyclopedia for a report without giving credit.

In the seven questions involving seeing others cheat, answers were 83% affirmative. As a matter of fact, the percentages increased in this section with 96% responding affirmatively on seeing someone cheat on a test, and 99% on seeing someone copy homework. An interesting observation was that there were no students who gave all negative answers regarding their own cheating, and no students who indicated that they had never seen others cheat.

As mentioned, on the question about copying someone's homework, the answers were 86% affirmative, and on letting someone copy their homework, answers were 91% affirmative. And when asked about seeing someone copy homework, the percentage of affirmative answers was up to 99%. However, when asked if it is wrong to let a friend copy homework, answers were split: 53% were affirmative and 46% negative. These responses showed a disparity between what students said was right and wrong and what they actually did. On the question asking if it is wrong to copy just one or two answers if you know most of them, the answers were 55% yes and 45% no. On a similar question, 46% of the students answered that it is O.K. to copy on a test if the test is too hard, and 47% said it is O.K. when the test is unfair.

In the last section of the questionnaire, students were asked to rate, on a scale of none to all, how many students in the school they thought cheated. Even though this did, of course, ask for an opinion and a feeling and therefore had many influencing factors, it was interesting to note their responses: 87% chose either many, most, or all.

Answers given to the open-ended questions served to underscore the students' opinions regarding cheating and the issue of right and wrong. When asked what they felt would be a good solution to the problem of cheating, 31 students said that there is no solution, and 10 more that they had no idea. A student indicated on another question that cheating

is not serious at all: "Everybody does it." Interestingly, the majority of suggested solutions given by students followed the same theme that much of the literature does; they gave ideas about what the teacher should do about cheating rather than what the student should do.

The questionnaire for teachers (see Appendix A) included 44 questions calling for yes/no responses, four open-ended questions, and one rating choice. In seven questions asking if they had seen students engaging in behaviors that indicated they were cheating, teachers gave answers averaging 84% affirmative. When asked about lowering grades because of cheating on homework, classwork, or tests, the answers were 91% affirmative. In relation to the use of plagiarism, answers were 63% affirmative. In response to the question, "Do you think that the students in this school consider cheating to be wrong?", 75% of the teachers chose no. On the question, "Do you feel that the students at this school in general care about the right and wrong in such issues?", all of the teachers answered no. One student on his questionnaire made a comment that summed up rather well the sad feelings many people in education have about this subject of cheating: "It can never be stopped. We'll just have a lot of stupid people in the work force." However, accepting this idea as a final answer would offer no hope for needed improvement.

Causative Analysis

The problem of cheating in high schools is not a simple one, and the issues that can be seen as its causes are not simplistic, either. Cheating is one symptom of a lowered moral standard so its causes appear to be integrated with larger problems that are occurring today in society, the home, and the entire school program.

Moral training is not being given in the homes of students or in the schools to the degree it once was. Changes in family structure and in the time parents spend with their children affect the amount of moral training children receive. Edwards (1990) comments, "Parents who get, at best, a few hours with their children are understandably less than eager to devote those hours to the dreary task of laying down the law, or delivering dour sermons on appropriate behavior..." (p.9). A school board candidate commented in a newspaper interview that schools should take an increased role in teaching values and morality "because the dynamics of families are changing and children are coming to school ill-prepared to be accountable for their actions, responsible, respectful of others and their property" ("It's status quo," 1990). Schools backed away from the morals issue in the 1960's, and church and state separation became a prominent issue. Engeler (1990) notes that values education as a school subject just about

disappeared when the Supreme Court ruled out prayer in schools, and "...the social upheavals of the '60's made educators aware that values are not universal but unique to various ethnic and religious groups" (p.32). Today, many schools and teachers still shy away from the teaching of morals for reasons that have their base in the church/state controversies or in programs that have been introduced in the intervening period (Nazario, 1990; Ryan & Greer, 1989).

Dishonesty in various forms has become a seemingly inevitable and sometimes accepted part of our society. The scope of this dishonesty is frightening: "The U.S. Chamber of Commerce gripes that together I and my fellow non-thieves pilfer a total of $40 billion a year from our employers.... almost one-third of all business failures in the United States can somehow be blamed on internal theft" (Rodkin, 1990). The decline in the moral condition of our society is reflected in the increase in crime, illegitimate births, drug use, etc., as well as in dishonesty and irresponsibility (Christenson, 1981; Gow, 1985; Hechinger, 1990). Gaddy and Kelly (1981) discuss other scandals and state that "Ethical behavior is absent too often in our society" (p.65). Brandt (1990) speaks about these conditions:

> Today's world is so different from the world of the 1950's, which was relatively certain of its values and firm in its beliefs, that only someone who has

> lived through the changes can understand fully how violent and immense they have been. Particularly the changes in moral codes. (p.115)

The detrimental effects of a lower moral standard in society are not sufficiently offset by positive role models. All too often, they are reinforced by negative models in the daily news and among people of our own acquaintance and knowledge. Hammond (1989) is explicit when he quotes Margaret Carlson, an English teacher, who said, "Students have become so cynical, what with Watergate, Pete Rose, Jim Wright, the whole scene, they just laugh at the idea of honesty" (p.5).

Students often experience confusion as to what constitutes right and wrong in regard to values such as honesty and are unable on their own to formulate a sound values system due to immature judgement (Christenson, 1981; McLaughlin & Ross, 1989; Stanwyck & Abdelal, 1984). "Too many hear contradicting values avidly promoted, and feel too many contradicting pressures inside themselves and from the world around them" (Harmin, 1990, p.22). Bauer (1986) adds, "And our children are growing up with very confused and sometimes dangerous notions of what it means to act morally and responsibly in today's society" (p.24). Some explanation for this confusion has been given in the reasons previously stated. Urie Bronfenbrenner, as quoted in a newspaper article, summarizes, "He [the average child of 10

in the United States] is, in fact, taught by his surroundings that it is unrealistic to maintain standards of honesty that are ridiculed by his friends and ignored by his elders" (Hechinger, 1990).

Fear of failure, overemphasis on competition, and parent and peer pressure are also strong forces that can work against honesty (McLaughlin & Ross, 1989; Parks & Barron, 1977; Radest, 1989). Menninger (1973) agrees that "pressures upon individual integrity in the face of group attitudes of this kind are particularly burdensome to children" (p.159). McLaughlin and Ross (1989) deduct from their study that cheating is common in our schools, and they make this observation: "This may be due to many factors - peer expectancies, fear of failure, pressure for grades, and lack of consequences. Successful cheating in school can serve only to increase reliance on similar behaviors in later years" (p. 104).

Students at this school fit societal patterns and were, therefore, affected by these same causes. Because they are societal causes, they would apply to most schools and probably had an even greater percentage of applicability in an alternative school for at-risk students. The reasons that brought these students to this school - poor attitude, poor school behavior, lack of academic success due especially to poor motivation - underlined the fact that they were affected by a lack of moral training. Cumulative

records, guidance office records, and parent/teacher conferences gave information that indicated a lack of sound home background and training. The encounters with the law that a number of the students had had and the occurrences at the school of stealing and other types of dishonesty also emphasized this lack.

As detailed in the documentation, a discrepancy existed in the questionnaire data between answers regarding what students said was right and what they really did, showing a confusion between knowledge and behavior and, perhaps, in the understanding of right and wrong on the part of some. The study done by McLaughlin and Ross (1989) agreed with this: "Despite classifying copying homework and examination answers as serious types of cheating, many students reported that they frequently engaged in these behaviors" (p. 102-103).

On the second questionnaire, 75% of the teachers indicated that they believed that the students in this school did not consider cheating to be wrong, and all of them felt that the students in general did not care about the issue of right and wrong in this matter. Greer and Ryan (1989) believe that young people are definitely in trouble and "...the major contributor to that trouble is that they do not understand nor have they acquired the moral values and character traits they need to be good citizens and good people" (p.26).

Relationship of the Problem to the Literature

There was no lack of literature related to ethical values and the need for moral education. Two of the main points that were made in the literature are intertwined: 1) It is vital that children have positive training in moral issues because 2) they are being influenced in moral matters in some way whether or not parents and teachers are aware of that influence. Owen Edwards (1990) was speaking particularly to parents, but his words could be applied to other adults:

> ...no matter how reluctant, preoccupied, or busy we may be, or how resistant they may be, our children are going to learn ethics from us anyway, simply by observing how we behave. The ethics they see in us may be good, bad, or fuzzy, but...we can't escape the unsettling fact that we're on the spot. (p.9)

Teachers must be alert to the truth that this learning of morals is going on in the classrooms, also. Delattre (1990) says that most teachers realize this, and "Teachers who behave as if they were value neutral in the presence of the young succeed only in teaching their students that they are being deceptive, probably manipulative" (p.44). Greer and Ryan (1989) state that teachers cannot avoid influencing student values; "Issues of right and wrong are part of the very fabric of life in schools. We need to make sure these

issues are being dealt with in the most positive, effective, and explicit manner" (p.27).

It is true, however, that young people will not necessarily know and understand all the moral truth we wish them to have through observation alone. William Bennett, former Secretary of Education, says, "If we want our children to possess the traits of character we most admire, we need to teach them what those traits are" (Bennett, 1988, p.85). This is a job that should be shared by the home and the school. As has been noted, the small amount of organized training in both areas has created a deficiency in society. The literature revealed information regarding crime, illegitimacy, abortion, and pornography, as well as facts about dishonesty, irresponsibility, and incivility, all of which are detrimental factors in our society today (Christenson, 1981; Molnar, 1990; Rodkin, 1990; Ryan & Greer, 1989). The existence of the problem of cheating is very real; Schab's studies in 1969 and 1979 emphasized the prevalence of it in the schools (Schab, 1980, p.959). Moss (1984) cited a study which "found that over 75% of entering college freshmen felt cheating was a normal part of life (p.1). It seems quite clear that something needs to be done; emphasis on morals education is a good beginning.

Attention is given to the fact that the changes in homes and families have made a difference in the contribution they are making to the moral development of the

nation's youth. "Many conclude that families have forsaken aspects of their traditional responsibilities" (Gaddy & Kelly, 1981, p.65). It is clear from Gallup Polls (Greer & Ryan, 1989; Nazario, 1990) that parents are in favor of the schools becoming more active in morals education; other authors (Bennett, 1988; Cooper, 1990; Ryan & Greer, 1989) agree that parents see the need for moral education in the public schools. Christenson (1981) expands on the need, "The moral condition and direction of our society, then, has caused religious and nonreligious parents alike to undertake a renewed search for ways to revive constitutionally the teaching of moral principles in the schools" (p.37).

Molnar (1990) stresses the responsibility of education; "In 1990 it is especially important for schools to help children learn individual moral behaviors and also to see the need to improve the social ethic" (p.74). There are some educators who are not ready to accept this assignment (Nazario, 1990), but others agree that it is imperative. Brandt (1990) explains, "Schools are beginning to respond to this demand, with programs specifically designed to impart the moral values that kids are presumably not getting in the home or from their churches or synagogues" (p.115). Greer and Ryan (1989) believe that "to have good schools, it is necessary to have students with character and good values....unless they develop values such as responsibility and persistence, few children will ever become good

students" (p.26), and Harmin (1990) states, "...when we help students develop the good side of themselves, we see academic improvement as well....It may be the only way to educate for life-long learning" (p.1).

Kohlberg (1981), using Piaget's work as a basis, "...constructed the typology of definite and universal levels of development in moral thought" (p.16). His six stages of moral development outline the changes that he believed take place as a child grows and develops mentally and morally. Many others have built upon Kohlberg's work in their study of morality. Duska and Whelan (1975) comment,

> ...in light of the theories of Piaget and Kohlberg, the role of the moral educator is to help the child, adolescent or adult to think about the reasoning he uses to resolve genuine moral conflicts, to see inadequacies in his reasoning, and to lead him to more adequate structures. (p.111)

Other educators also see the possibility of aiding students in this moral development. Stiles and Johnson (1977) state, "Moral behavior is learned" (p.xii) and note that parents, community, religious institutions, and schools all have a contribution to make in influencing young people. "And there," according to Edwards (1990), "we have the hardest part of all: teaching ethics to our children demands that we think constantly about ethics for ourselves, which can make life more complicated than we might like" (p.9).

CHAPTER III

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES AND EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

The following goals and behavioral objectives were projected for this practicum.

Goals and Expectations

Students will understand that knowledge of the difference between accepted right and wrong should affect their choices of behavior, especially in regard to academic honesty. They will comprehend principles and motives that underlie behavior and how these can be applied to their personal behavior choices. They will know principles and strategies for use in making moral decisions. They will understand what plagiarism is and how people get involved in it, and become familiar with research methods to help them to avoid it.

Behavioral Objectives

After the implementation period, English students in groups five and six:

1. will demonstrate an increase in their understanding of accepted right and wrong in relation to cheating on tests and daily work, by a 15-point move toward a negative attitude about cheating on Part A of the pre/posttest.
2. will demonstrate an understanding of the values of making right choices over making expedient ones by the change in Part A of the pre/posttest and as observed by the teacher during the discussion periods.
3. will demonstrate an understanding of strategies for making moral judgements by writing fuller and more comprehensive answers in Part B of the pre/posttest.
4. will comprehend the meaning of plagiarism, its various facets, and the reasons it is considered to be wrong as demonstrated in more knowledgeable answers on Part B of the pre/posttest and in oral answers and comments during discussion periods.
5. will understand methods of research that will enable them to compose quality reports without resorting to plagiarism as demonstrated by more knowledgeable answers on Part B of the pre/posttest and as illustrated by the written reports submitted during the implementation.

Measurement of Objectives

A pre/posttest was used to measure changes in student attitude toward cheating. It was difficult to find an instrument that would measure only the attitude toward cheating, not general moral attitudes. In the search for a useful instrument, a reference to the "Attitude Toward Cheating Scale (ATCS)" was found (see Appendix B). Contact was made with Dr. David Sherrill, the source listed, who sent a copy of this instrument, which appeared to be a zeroxed, not a published, copy. The test, as written, was more suitable for college classes, so after an examination of it, a second contact was made with Dr. Sherrill. He was very cooperative as to its adaptation and granted blanket permission to use the whole test or parts of it as needed. The pre/posttest (see Appendix C) was designed with his instrument as the base of Part A. Part A now consists of 24 statements to which students respond. "Each item is responded to in terms of a forced-choice, 6-point scale (strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, disagree, strongly disagree; coded +3, +2, +1, -1, -2, and -3, respectively)" (Tests and Measurements, 1976, p.979). For scoring, the directionality of some items must be reversed, as indicated on the test copy in Appendix C. Part B contains four open-ended questions and one yes/no response, all related to plagiarism and decision making.

This pre/posttest was administered to the target groups during the second week of the implementation. Students were asked not to put their names on the test, but to identify it with a secret number for later comparison (Decisions, 1989, p.9). After the introduction and the explanation of the rating scale, they wrote their responses on the test itself. The students were allowed the amount of time they needed to complete it, approximately 25-30 minutes. The test was administered again at the end of the implementation as a posttest.

Teacher observation and informal evaluation were also used in assessing progress and change in student attitudes. The teacher made notes regarding significant class happenings, discussions, and comments that appeared to indicate student attitude. Logs were kept by student recorders during some discussions, and reaction papers were also used. In the section of the implementation dealing with research and plagiarism, students prepared research reports.

CHAPTER IV

SOLUTION STRATEGY

Discussion and Evaluation of Possible Solutions

Students in the school did not demonstrate an active understanding of right and wrong in regard to dishonesty, especially cheating. Questionnaires completed by students and teachers indicated that students in English classes had a deficiency in understanding and applying principles of accepted right and wrong to situations involving the possibility of cheating.

Solutions for a problem as serious and as involved as cheating could not be simple. "There are few easy answers in life, and almost none when it comes to what's right and what's wrong" (Brandt, 1990, p.121). In the literature, quite a few articles were found that had suggestions concerning how to "catch" the student who cheats or how to be on guard against it, but satisfactory solutions for dealing with the base issue of personal dishonesty were difficult to uncover. Much of the responsibility appeared to be on the teachers for obtaining a decrease in cheating.

Fogg (1976) says, "The tough problems related to cheating are how to prevent it, how to apprehend offenders, and how to deal with them" (p.329). These problems are very real, but how about the "tough" problem of teaching the students the principles of morality and personal responsibility? When cheating is dealt with in the literature, it is more likely a matter of treating symptoms than a diagnosis and treatment of the cause. Fogg (1976) makes an additional surprising statement:

> ...typically neither a class of honors high school students nor a student who has been caught cheating can give more than simplistic reasons why cheating is bad....Conventional teachers do not often discuss in depth the reasons for avoiding cheating, relying on a hortatory statement that cheating is bad and upon giving failing grades. (p.329)

Moss (1984) mentions that after an incident with student cheating, the teacher should call the parents, and he suggests this remark, "We'll deal with the discipline aspect here at school,... Would you please deal with the moral aspects raised by the situation.[sic] I think it's better for the parent to deal with that" (p.9). No wonder there is such a problem with the cheating in school if it is assumed that teachers should not deal with moral issues; teachers seem to be left with the inference that they are

possibly afraid, incapable, or unqualified to do so, or that it is not their job!

One origin of the reticence toward the teaching of morals was reaction against the indoctrination and imposition styles of teaching morals. In reacting against these, many educators went to the other extreme of ignoring or skirting the issue. During the 1960's, Values Clarification was brought into existence as an endeavor to fill this need. Then, in the 70's, Kohlberg came on the scene with his moral development theories, based on the work of Piaget. These programs were not entirely satisfactory and other methods have been appearing, incorporating the use of dilemmas, dialogue, philosophical discussion, and thinking strategies. A closer look at these past and present solution offerings should clarify some of the issues.

Harmin (1990) states, "Until recently, most moral educators assumed morality could be forced on students" (p.12). Methods which basically used indoctrination or imposition followed this pattern. He realistically comments that these methods didn't always work, "but most people at the time agreed about what was right and what was wrong and, perhaps because social pressures were steady and uniform, the approach did not seem to receive much criticism" (p.12). On a workshop tape from the Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique at Sonoma University, Rita Manning (1990)

observes that even though there are situations in which it can be useful, indoctrination is not a way of teaching and should not be used to intimidate students into believing what is right and wrong.

The process of Values Clarification, according to Sidney Simon (1973), is for the student "...to learn about himself and what he values. It does not give him values; rather, it permits the discovery of his own values" (p.738). Although these programs were sold into many schools, more thought and enlightenment about this objective revealed many weaknesses. Rita Manning (1990) comments that Values Clarification suggests that all values are equal and the teacher must figure out her values and help the students figure out theirs and learn to live with them. She agrees it <u>is</u> necessary to know what values a person holds at the start, but it is <u>not enough</u>. Bauer (1986) says, "In fact, the general assumption behind Values Clarification is that there are no reliable standards of right and wrong - each person develops a morality which is right 'for him'" (p.25). Ryan and Greer (1989) state that some teachers "...speak about moral education and values clarification as if they were one and the same. Very few are aware that the claims of values clarification have been empirically discredited" (p.12). This is not surprising if one looks carefully at the purposes and claims of Values Clarification. Gow (1985) observes, "We have always taught children that lying and

cheating and stealing are wrong. Parents taught it. Teachers taught it. Not necessarily so anymore. At least not for teachers who follow the popular strategy of Values Clarification" (p.24). Delattre (1990) feels that "...the more astute students will soon see that attempting to convey value neutrality as an appropriate way to believe and behave condemns life to triviality and education to insignificance..." (p.44).

Kohlberg (1981) says of his work, "...I have gradually elaborated over the years a typological scheme describing general stages of moral thought that can be defined independently of the specific content of particular moral decisions or actions" (p.16). Kohlberg's six stages deal, as he said, with a person's moral thought and cognitive development. According to Brandt (1990), programs based on Kohlberg's theories were popular in the 1970's and probably still would be, but research revealed that the use of his theories affected children's thinking about morality but did not bring about much change in behavior; "...follow-up evaluations showed that reasoning well did not translate into acting well, and the schools have generally abandoned formal programs based on Kohlberg's model" (p.116). Gow (1985) would have agreed that it was the best idea to abandon them because she writes, "...Kohlberg has been adamant in his rejection of traditional moral education as useless and totalitarian" (p.55).

Since such programs were found to be wanting, it was a difficult search for a solution suitable to the writer's inclination and beliefs, the practicum requirements, and the situation in which it was needed. The solution of Values Clarification was not acceptable, as noted, except for helping students and teacher evaluate what values were presently being held. Kohlberg's theory did not offer sufficient training in developing realistic morals applicable to behavior. During this search, the writer was advised that it might be necessary to create the solution. As this thought was being assimilated, ideas from the literature began to come together.

A comment by Kirshenbaum and Simon (1969), associating the use of literary work with the teaching of values, was relevant: "The English teacher with his unique, value-oriented subject matter can do more about values than almost any other teacher in the school" (p.1113). Bauer (1986) and Bennett (1988) both spoke at length about how history or literature can be used in morals education.

> Sometimes conflict in the areas of history or literature provides a wonderful dramatization of moral ideals set against each other. This not only exposes students to the relevant ethical criteria, but it complicates the issue by making them choose, as indeed in real life we frequently have to do. (Bauer, p.26)

For an English course, it was obvious that one area to be considered was plagiarism. In the particular work setting it was felt that often students did not accomplish what was expected in various assignments because they really did not know how to proceed, and someone assumed that they did. The writer felt that was true in the composition of reports; lack of knowledge in procedures, as well as in rules of authorship, easily leads to plagiarism. Ward (1988) expressed his view, "Nobody wants to be guilty of plagiarism. Mind you, not everyone knows what it is" (p.38). A paper by Mary Anne Saunders (1986) produced a good plan for helping students write "The Fail-Safe Micro Research Paper" by becoming their "tour guide" through the project, "...someone who knew the rules and regulations of this new country" (p.2).

Vincent Ruggiero's workshop on tape from the Conference on Critical Thinking and Educational Reform (1990) presented an excellent plan for teaching students a strategy for moral decisions. He discussed establishing a framework for judgement, delineating the ideals, obligations, and consequences, and considering the priorities. These procedures gave a solid base for the morals discussion section of the solution. Ruggiero and others (Greer & Ryan, 1989; McLaughlin & Ross, 1989) suggested using dilemmas - real-life, literary, or created - to set the stage for the practice of these strategies of decision making. Many

authors encouraged the use of discussion and dialogue for getting the students to understand and deal with the values involved (Harmin, 1990; Radest, 1989). "Teachers turn events into the stuff of moral education, but we cannot preach a sermon. Instead, the morally interesting situation plays out naturally in a dialogue" (Radest, 1989, p.124).

The writer was especially interested in ideas received at a critical thinking conference, and also in print, about Socratic discussion. Kurtines and Gewirtz (1984) showed the relation of Socrates to moral values, "Socrates...believed that there could be an absolute standard by which our thoughts and actions might be evaluated (and that the human mind could come to know it)..." (p.6). In order to challenge the students' thinking, "...the goal towards which a philosophical discussion should move is one in which there is maximum student-student interchange, as opposed to the start of such a discussion, in which teacher-student interchange is at a maximum" (Lipman, Sharp, & Oscanyan, 1980, p.4). The objective of such discussion is to lead students to find out for themselves about truths and values. "A person who comes to understand and accept a moral principle as his own and who has had experience in applying it, will be more likely to abide by it" (Parks & Barron, 1977, p.20). These were teaching strategies that fit well into a language arts classroom.

Through references in the literature, contact was made with the Character Education Institute, which publishes lessons for the teaching of moral values. The sections of this material on honesty and truthfulness were a part of the solution; the assistant principal even decided to purchase these materials for the school.

The methods and materials discussed were used in the "creation" of the solution. Students at the school had values, of course, as everyone does. Some had values that fit the way they were or the way they perceived society to be, and some of these were not as worthy as could be desired. Some students had higher values than others but did not have the strength to live by them or did not know procedures to help. In most cases, students needed to discover and establish values that would cause people to say of them, "Those young people have morals." Bauer (1986) agreed, "Our children will retain their moral principles only when they have been thoroughly explored and students have had an opportunity to see them challenged and successfully defended" (p.27). Then, hopefully, they will "...realize that...honesty is regularly the best choice in this society and always has been" (Greer & Ryan, 1989, p.28).

Description of Selected Solution

The created solution consisted of a twelve-week teaching unit for groups five and six that was used in the writer's class periods with them. This unit was the main part of the course for the twelve weeks and was used in concert with vocabulary study. The varied ideas discussed came together into a solution with three branches.

Branch one was the reading of literature with related activities; branch two was the study and application of moral issues and strategies; and branch three contained student research and the study of plagiarism. These branches came together to create the solution. Teaching methods and activities tied the three parts together; dialogue, discussion, silent and oral reading, and the writing of answers and paragraph reactions were all language arts methods that were useful throughout the unit.

Branch one - the literature section - included literary selections from various genre. The teacher had multiple objectives in using the literature, such as growth in appreciation, comprehension, and reading skills as well as the objectives that apply to this solution - to introduce moral issues to the classroom and provide examples of the use of honesty and dishonesty and the resulting consequences. Through these examples the students could see the values of making right choices instead of expedient ones

and comprehend the results of wrong choices. The literature, however, was not the primary conveyor of moral principles, but a means of introducing these principles and related ideas into the lessons and discussions. The unit opened with the literature branch with the aim of leading the students to free discussion and of fostering an open atmosphere to make that possible. The hope was to have the students themselves discover a need for deeper, more thorough discussions. Many students did enjoy these discussions and participated actively.

Branch two included the study and application of moral issues and strategies. The goals were to increase the students' understanding of accepted right and wrong and to teach strategies for making moral judgements. Helping the students understand why they shouldn't cheat was more important and more difficult than just telling them not to do it. One of the materials used in this study was the chapter entitled "Honesty and Truthfulness" in the book Decisions About Me from the Character Education Institute. This is comprised of exercises and discussion formats to lead the students to discover truths concerning these matters and to evaluate their findings and their thoughts.

The procedures and strategies of Vincent Ruggiero were used as the other main conveyor of information in this moral studies branch of the solution. His structured suggestions offered students the opportunity to learn methods for

dealing with their own problems of life, as well as providing the way for the class to continue consideration of the honesty issue. Answers or strategies that can be applied to real-life situations were of vital importance to these at-risk young people.

Two sessions of approximately 30 minutes were to be planned each week for the morals study. However, as anticipated, it did not always work out that way. The literature and the moral study often tended to blend together through the first section of the unit.

The third branch of the solution was the research component. The procedures that were followed were adapted from Mary Anne Saunders' article, "The Fail-Safe Micro Research Paper" (1990). This article outlines a method by which the teacher leads the class through the steps of writing a research project; the introductory phases of the project are worked through as a group, and eventually each student writes his own paper. A field trip was made to a university library to acquaint students with the facilities and to help them learn and practice the skills needed to do research. This was of special importance because there was no library in the work setting. Accompanying the research project were discussions regarding copyright laws, the different faces of plagiarism, its penalties, and, of course, the basic reasons for avoiding it. Students received information to help them in writing reports without

plagiarism - if they wanted to. The whole point of this practicum was that students should acquire some "want to" in the direction of honesty. The pretest and the posttest aided in ascertaining the progress of this movement.

These three branches were the heart of the unit. They complemented each other and provided conditions in which the students could comprehend that the study of honesty is a life skill. Christenson (1981) makes an interesting and hopeful comment:

> Whatever their outward show of independence and (often) rebelliousness, young people want to know right from wrong - especially if persuasive reasons are given for moral beliefs, rather than "It's right because we say so." Youngsters need well-defined standards of right conduct, even if they are going to resist them. Few things are more troubling or unsettling to teen-agers than not to know right from wrong. If we can't answer all their questions, we can point to general principles that are enormously helpful to them as they make decisions. (p.39)

Report of Action Taken

Implementation began the week of March 4, 1991, and culminated the week of May 28, 1991. It involved the writer

and the English students in groups five and six at the alternative high school described. The writer was the teacher of the classes; her roles as the unit developed were planner, information source, discussion leader, facilitator, and guide. Classes were ninety minutes in length and met three times weekly. As planned, a pretest, titled Opinion Survey, (see Appendix C) was given during the second week to appraise the students' attitudes toward cheating and their knowledge of plagiarism and moral decision-making strategies. The same test was given at the completion of the solution unit as a posttest.

The solution followed the three branches planned - literature and related work, study of moral issues and strategies, and plagiarism and research. The implementation began with the literature branch to build an introductory base for the entire solution unit. Literary selections included short stories, fables, and poems that dealt in some way with honesty or dishonesty. Related activities included questions and answers, definitions and implications of the words integrity and honesty, analyzation and discussions of the literary characters and their actions, and reflections on why people lie - a companion issue to cheating; cheating really is lying.

In these activities students expressed some ideas that gave much cause for thought. When asked if it mattered if Jerry (a short story character) had integrity, considering

that he was only 12, most answers were positive. "Yes, it's something everyone should have, even if he's only 12" and "The earlier you begin to achieve your integrity, the more you'll have in the future" did, however, contrast somewhat with "No, around 15, you should." Among many reasons why people lie, students listed, "Because society actually condones lying, and it's become part of our daily lives," and "Truth is out of style." Quite perceptive of what is really happening, isn't it? It is true that students often say things for shock effect, but throughout the unit, many comments and answers underlined the real need for such consideration of cheating and other moral issues.

In the moral study branch, discussion groups concerned with questions and issues from the Character Education materials proved to be of considerable interest to students and teacher. These discussion circles dealt with issues of honesty, dishonesty, and cheating. During the discussion, group procedures included having reporters keep track of the incidence of student contribution as well as comments made. Although encouraged, some students did not wish to participate much or at all, but many did participate, and some were very active; there were even those who had trouble letting others talk and controlling their attitudes and words. In an endeavor to establish more order in the discussion, each group generated a list of discussion rules. This helped the students understand how the discussion

should proceed, in contrast to how it was proceeding. In a workshop on Socratic discussion, the writer had heard the suggestion that with a large group double circles could be used. The inside group would talk while the outside group listened; then the groups would change places. With these classes, the response to a trial of this was very negative; they did not wish to wait when they had something to say.

The discussion circles were a means of getting into students' thoughts; abundant comments, both pro and con, were made in regard to cheating in school and similar issues involving a choice of honesty or dishonesty. Questions such as "What are the consequences of being caught cheating in school?" and "What are some of the disadvantages of cheating if you are not caught?" (Character Education Institute, 1989, p.9) elicited thoughtful responses. Students expressed varying opinions and recounted situations that they had experienced in regard to the issue at hand. They seemed to sense an open class environment for they were generally quite free in their comments, even to the extent that, at times, a few expressed rather condoning attitudes toward dishonest actions which would then lead to further discussion. It was good to hear others defend right behavior. Because of the peer pressure that young people experience in school toward cheating and similar behaviors, one of the unwritten goals of the unit was to help students feel it was OK to do right and speak of it. It was

rewarding to see this happen at times during the implementation.

During these circles, the give-and-take and the comments brought up were extremely interesting and revealing. Along this line, it was worth observing the differences between the two groups as the lessons proceeded. An experienced teacher realizes that each group's handling of these sessions (or of this whole matter) would be different. Classes have definite personalities, and the issues that this solution brought up highlighted some interesting facets of those personalities. In group five were several people who seemed to enjoy taking the negative position and arguing that dishonest things could be done under certain circumstances. However, one day when pushed on the issue, "Then it really is OK to do this <u>if</u> the circumstances dictate?" they could not admit that it was really acceptable to do the wrong. The most they could say was "It's not all right, <u>but</u> ...", leading into the subject of rationalization. It also caused one of their classmates who differed with them to say, "What would people do if there were no excuses?" Good question!

In the area of moral decision-making, it is important for an individual to have a preexisting plan if wise decisions are to be made in situations which demand immediate choices. To fill this need, Ruggiero's strategies for the making of moral decisions (1990) were presented. He

explains five steps in which a person should consider and weigh the obligations and the ideals, assign priorities, determine the possible courses of action and the consequences of each, and apply critical thinking to make a decision. Many of the students seemed interested in the idea of having a strategy that could be used when they were faced with problems that require such decisions. In class they used his steps to discuss some dilemmas presented to them.

These two branches of the solution, literature and moral study, tended to blend together, as mentioned. At one point of the proposed solution, there were to be two sessions of approximately 30 minutes each week for the moral issues and strategies branch. The writer did not tend to plan separately for these sections, but planned the solution procedures of these branches into the class without the division. The discussions and comments about the themes and characters in the short stories and fables were largely dealing with the moral issues, so the parts intermingled.

The third branch of the solution dealing with research and plagiarism utilized the adapted procedures for researching from the article The Fail-Safe Micro Research Paper by Mary Anne Saunders (1986). The procedures in this article center around having each class work as a unit on the preparatory stages of the research so that all could learn correct methodology; then each student would write his

own paper on the class topic. The classes discussed the subject of plagiarism and the reasons it is considered cheating, later using information taken from the book, 10 Steps in Writing the Research Paper (Markman, Markman, & Waddell, 1989, pp.119-126). Each class worked at selecting a class topic, as suggested in Saunders' article. It took the students longer than the time originally allotted to make this selection because of their strong differing interests. After all the suggestions, eliminations, narrowing, and voting, the topics were finally settled.

When topics were ready, a field trip was made to a local university library to accomplish a double purpose; the students needed to get articles for the development of their papers and to become acquainted with the facilities and uses of a research library. Necessary advance preparations had been made, including permission slips, scheduling of a school bus, and a meeting by the writer with the librarian in charge of group visits. To make the trip easier, an information sheet was prepared for the students; it listed the names in each working group of two or three students, the assignment, and some helpful procedures. The students were reminded that they would need money to photocopy their articles. Each student was required to have one article on his subject copied for classroom use. Available to help students in finding their articles were the writer, another teacher, and two university students who worked as interns

at the alternative school, in addition to the librarians. The trip went well, and plans are made to repeat it.

Back in class, the best articles were chosen for information gathering. In this section of the implementation, the time element became a real problem, which will be discussed in detail later. The students worked together in groups to get information from the best articles and take down direct quotations that they might wish to use in their papers. They were cautioned at various times to be sure to get all bibliographic information they would later need for documentation. The actual composition of the papers was then the job of each individual student.

As would be expected, some difficulties and deviations did arise during the implementation. All activities did not occur in the assigned week of the original plan, as is usually the case with plans designed so far in advance. The writer also found that, as teachers often do, she had put too much into the projected plans in order to be sure that there was enough to do. There was - and more! Some of the supplementary activities, such as the oral presentations in literature, were not used. It is true that the first time a unit or course of study is taught is always the hardest and is also very profitable for the teacher, for she discovers what improvements are needed.

Several interventions and difficulties caused disruption in the time factor. Frustration was experienced

in finding as much literature as was desired to introduce the ideas of honesty and dishonesty into discussion. It was especially difficult to locate literature that was solely on the cheating issue, particularly on a high school level and of a length that could fit into the time period of the literature branch; the continued search caused some delay. Naturally, there were the interruptions, which are almost sure to happen in classroom teaching; assemblies, a science field trip, and two teacher planning days came within this period of time.

A problem arose about the library trip because the community college to which the trip was planned would not accept the number of students in the two classes. Fortunately, the university library was accommodating. The intrusion of distractions and the extreme busyness of the writer's schedule with and during the implementation prevented the keeping of a journal as planned. Recording was done by students during discussions, and notes of various happenings were kept by the teacher, but an organized, daily journal would have been very helpful and interesting.

The matter of time was very important in this practicum and needs considerable attention in replication. The problem of cheating and dishonesty is one that has deeply engrained itself into today's society and its students. Habits such as cheating are not changed easily or

quickly; they were acquired gradually over a period of time and are not completely altered in two or three months. A beginning was made, and that beginning made students think. Interests were aroused and results achieved, but a longer period of emphasis would provide a wider opportunity for further knowledge, more introspection and learning, and more lasting effects.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results

In the public alternative high school which was the work setting, students did not demonstrate an active understanding of right and wrong in regard to dishonesty, especially cheating. Dishonesty, demonstrated through cheating on tests, copying homework and classwork papers, and the use of plagiarism, was extremely frustrating to the classroom teachers. Questionnaires indicated that students in English classes had a deficiency in understanding and applying principles of accepted right and wrong to situations involving the possibility of cheating.

The solution implemented was a twelve-week teaching unit used as a part of the English curriculum for that period. The teaching unit was comprised of three branches: Branch one involved the reading of literature with related work, branch two dealt with the study and application of

moral issues and strategies, and branch three contained research work and the study of plagiarism.

Results of the implementation are reported in their relation to the behavioral objectives set forth at the beginning of the practicum. Objective one stated that students will demonstrate an increase in their understanding of accepted right and wrong in relation to cheating on tests and daily work, by a 15-point move toward a negative attitude about cheating on Part A of the pre/posttest. On the test, the range was a -72 (an extreme negative attitude toward cheating) to a +72 (an extreme positive attitude approving cheating). The compilation and comparison of the data from the pretests and posttests revealed a definite move toward a negative attitude about cheating but not in the amount projected in the objective. The pretest median was -8.32 and the posttest median was -14.89, making the actual average move 6.57. Changes in attitude were also reflected in other figures from the pre/posttest data. On the pretest, the mode was a -14 and the median was a -12; on the posttest, the mode was a -23 and the median was a -17.

Objective two stated that students will demonstrate an understanding of the values of making right choices over making expedient ones by the change in Part A of the pre/posttest and as observed by the teacher during the discussion periods. The results of Part A of the pre/posttest have been reported. The reporting and

evaluation of comments made during the discussion periods are subjective and difficult to judge. The comments made depended on the particular question or topic introduced and on the students present at the session and what they felt like sharing at the moment. However, some interesting comments and observations were made during the discussions; of course, all cannot be reported.

At one time, discussion brought out the observation that "Everyone cheats", gave the general impression that if a friend asks to cheat a person would usually say yes, and made the point that it was likely OK to cheat if it was only once. On the other hand, a student mentioned that many people he had seen in evening school were there because they didn't learn what they should have the first time (his assumption - they probably cheated instead of studying).

The next week, in a discussion of the issue of cheating in a game and whether it is worth it, comments again varied. "Worthiness depends on the result," cheating kills self-esteem and makes a person feel guilty and angry at himself, and cheating is not fair to others. Students also spoke of the fact that cheating is addictive and people become calloused. They felt that some students begin to believe that they're not really cheating, and some don't feel guilty because they are so used to it or think it's a game. In contrast to an earlier idea about doing it only

once, "You lure yourself into doing it over and over again. You lower your standards to benefit your greed."

In a later discussion about reasons for not cheating in school, the students brought out several drawbacks: Unfairness to others, self-guilt, hard to live with yourself, damage your reputation, harder than studying, possibility of getting kicked out of class or college. They also suggested that helping others study or offering a class to help students learn to study are ways that cheating could be avoided.

In this and ensuing meetings, peer pressure was a relevant subject. They agreed that it was hard to refuse a friend who wishes to copy, but comment was made that it is possible - you can say no! "Peer pressure doesn't go away, but it's up to you to make the decision." "It's always your choice to cheat or not." Comments stressed that peer pressure may cause you to want to do something, but what you do is your decision. One recorded comment seemed to be a good summary: "Cheating will be a way of making future events more difficult." This person made a good projection of consequences.

Objective three stated that students will demonstrate an understanding of strategies for making moral judgements by writing fuller and more comprehensive answers in Part B of the pre/posttest. The results on this section of the posttest were disappointing. On question three indicating

whether students used or knew any strategy or plan for decisions regarding matters of right or wrong, there was some increase in the percentage of yes answers. On the pretest, 56% answered yes, and on the posttest, 74% answered yes. However, many students just did not answer question four, which asked for the steps of a decision-making strategy; even some of those who had said yes to number three did not write what their strategy was. Only 22% of the posttests contained the steps of the Ruggiero strategy that were studied in the unit (Consider obligations and moral ideals; assign priorities; determine courses of action with consequences; apply critical thinking and make decision). But it is true that on the pretest none had listed ideas concerning obligations and priorities, although a number had mentioned consequences. This appeared to indicate some change, for consequences often apply more to one's self while obligations take others into consideration.

Objective four stated that students will comprehend the meaning of plagiarism, its various facets, and the reasons it is considered to be wrong as demonstrated in more knowledgeable answers on Part B of the pre/posttest and in oral answers and comments during discussion periods. On question one of the pretest, 32% of the papers had no definition of plagiarism or an incomplete or incorrect one (having one or more husbands or wives?). On the posttest, only 6% of the students did not write an answer; others gave

an acceptable definition. In the unit, the teacher had emphasized that plagiarism includes, in addition to word-for-word copying, use of the author's thoughts or ideas without giving proper credit. On the posttest, 41% of the answers included one of these words, in contrast to their use in only 17% of the pretest answers.

Many of these students had had instruction in another course on methods of avoiding plagiarism, so many generally acceptable answers appeared on the pretest for question two regarding such methods. Therefore, there was not appreciable change in the response to this question. Of course, on both tests one or two students came up with the idea that not assigning reports would help avoid plagiarism.

Objective five stated that students will understand methods of research that will enable them to compose quality reports without resorting to plagiarism as demonstrated by more knowledgeable answers on Part B of the pre/posttest and as illustrated by the written reports submitted during the implementation. Evaluation of the Part B answers regarding plagiarism has already been reported. Some students utilized partially the planned methods of research and documentation, but students did not appear to understand the methods of research adequately to complete papers in the manner planned and desired. Factors influencing this situation will be discussed further.

Discussion

Several factors may have influenced the degree of movement toward a negative attitude about cheating on the posttest. The choice of a 15-point move had to be an arbitrary, projected one, because this was the initial use for this pre/posttest. Then, the pretest recorded a more negative attitude toward cheating than might have been expected. Although there were positive scores, a few fairly high, the median was -8.32 on the pretest. On an evaluation like this, the scores can easily be affected by students who answer according to what they think is expected, what they think they should believe, or what they think they believe, rather than by what they <u>really</u> believe.

The work setting itself was, no doubt, influential; each school has its own characteristics. In this alternative school, one characteristic is a certain fluidity of class enrollment. As previously noted, there is a base of students who stay at the school, even for two or three years. Other students come, leave, and possibly return, since it is an at-risk population. Due to this factor and to absenteeism, the pre/posttest results are according to the composition of the groups at the times of testing. Also, some of the posttests were given by a proctor rather than by the writer, so less cooperation and less effort may have been given to completing them. The difference of 6.57

was a move in the desired direction and was a noticeable difference.

The degree of change and the weakness in the answers regarding strategies illustrated to the writer that perhaps the implementation period was not long enough to emphasize and reemphasize the necessary information and strategies required to change long-held habits, beliefs, and practices. Some students expressed interest in this strategy as something useful in their lives. More time for applying the strategy steps to many dilemmas of a diverse nature might have helped them comprehend the procedures more thoroughly so they would continue to use them in future decisions. Educators realize the absolute requirement for reemphasis and repetition to achieve lasting results. However, there was the necessity to move on to the research/plagiarism branch of the solution.

In this branch, the time was much too restricting to accomplish what needed to be done in teaching research methodology, especially with an aim to avoiding plagiarism. The classes needed at least two more weeks to complete the project and the papers as they should have. In addition, the writer's unexpected operation affected the completion of the research papers, for it took place right between the end of the implementation period and the time the papers were due.

This practicum was a start in finding out what can be accomplished in the field of moral studies, particularly in regard to cheating, through the English curriculum. The writer feels that although the objectives were not completely fulfilled, the practicum was an interesting beginning toward student awareness of the issues involved. The reasons the objectives were not fully met centered mostly around time. As stated, it takes longer periods of time and the opportunity for repeated practice to change habits. These habits have been developing for quite a few years and are constantly receiving much reinforcement on the negative side from other sources.

Participating in the discussion circles and hearing the things shared by some students about their beliefs, their methods of dealing with wrong, and their personal experiences made the writer even more aware of the need for this kind of unit. As discussed, there were distractions and difficulties, but the observation of the writer is that the solution was simply too ambitious for the time frame. Each of the branches offers sensible methodology for dealing with the issues of right and wrong, and each requires more time for the teacher and the students to develop its possibilities. All branches of the solution are worthwhile as part of an English curriculum; they just require fuller development over a longer period.

Recommendations

Several recommendations should be considered in future implementation of this solution. A complete implementation needs more time; there are a number of ways this could done. It would be plausible to extend the time and implement the unit over a minimum of one semester. It might also be possible to use the materials in one class a week for the whole year, if the continuity could be maintained. Or the solution unit could be used in partial class periods by teachers who like to keep two or more threads running in their classes all the time.

Since it was difficult to keep up with three branches and impossible to do everything needed, another possibility would be to divide the solution into two units. The literature selections and the moral studies could be used together (which appeared to happen rather naturally), and the research unit could be studied separately. In this way, students could receive the amount of concentrated attention they need to really improve research skills and understand and avoid plagiarism. In each area then, the teacher would have time to lead students to more decisive positions on the issues.

Realizing what research has revealed about the effects that repetition and review have on learning, the writer feels that one unit is definitely not enough to deal with a

subject such as moral issues. Gagne and Glaser (1987) state that although motor skills develop gradually, the learning of procedural knowledge is aided by spaced practice. "When the practice is spaced...as in spaced reviews, the retrievability of procedural knowledge is increased, presumably owing to the recruitment of additional cues during each review session" (p.52). A good plan, therefore, could be to follow implementation of this solution with a similar unit the next year for the same students. It might even be very sensible for students to receive a unit of this nature, with all three branches represented, during each year of high school. This plan would not only provide the time and emphasis that could offer more realistic opportunity for changing habits, but it would also give instruction and practice in the areas most students need - the language skills of reading, comprehension, and writing.

Recommendation is also made concerning the scope of the subject chosen. It was necessary to narrow this topic to cheating in schools because the necessity for documentation required a subject that was objective enough to be measureable. However, as may be evident, it was difficult to stay solely within the area of cheating, for it is just one segment of larger moral issues. This problem was aggravated by the scarity of literary selections and the fact that most prepared materials deal more broadly with the subject of honesty versus dishonesty. Even more to the

point is the fact that people's lives are not segmented, and neither are their moral values and actions. Cheating in school and out of school is a very distressing problem which desperately needs attention, but, of course, it is part of the larger picture of having or not having moral values that one not only believes, but practices. In replication, a teacher may find it useful to broaden the topic somewhat.

A few suggestions regarding procedures may also prove useful. Introducing and using the Socratic method of discussion previous to this particular unit would prepare the students in its use. If it were already an accepted part of classroom procedure, the issues for discussion could be emphasized to an even greater degree. Because students would be familiar and comfortable with the process, it would likely take less time to get through what students say to what they really do or would do. The group can then work toward the discovery of suitable answers, beliefs, and behaviors.

Extensive recordkeeping of various kinds will serve several purposes. There will be documentation of what has happened in classroom events, of the thoughts of teacher and students, and of whatever changes have taken place. Both teacher and students could keep journals of activities and especially of discussion comments and reactions. Reaction papers, possibly written also by teacher and students, will record not only happenings that could be seen, but also

happenings in the thoughts of the participants. These writing experiences will foster the students' writing abilities, encourage them to think critically about what is taking place in class and in discussion circles, and allow them and the teacher to see the progress that is being made. The emphasis on shared writing time could allow the students to see the teacher as a writer and comprehend the importance she places on writing and, at the same time, give the teacher time to keep the records she wishes to keep, which is not always possible in a busy schedule.

During the discussion periods, it might be well to preplan for student recorders for each day, or possibly even to have a casette recorder available. The presence of the casette recorder should be known to the students, and agreement made between them and the teacher as to exactly what uses will be made of the material recorded.

Something the writer used, which was not part of the original plan, might be of interest to others. From a group of sayings that she had collected, some applicable ones were posted in the room. Sayings such as "The ethical problem is not to understand the good, but to do it" and "The greatest discovery of my generation is that a human being can alter his life by altering his attitude" can be used in various ways, as desired. Just calling attention to the fact that the sayings are there will cause some students to think about their meanings; discussions and written work can also

be centered around the most appropriate ones. The writer has found that this type of assignment has been quite revealing of the degree of critical thinking skills a student is using. There may be some students who will be able to create sayings that fit what they are studying and thinking.

Dissemination

The writer plans to continue the use of the solution in her English classes. This will be done by dividing the solution unit into two sections and incorporating the literature/moral strategies section into the regular study of literature. The research section will become a separate unit with continuing emphasis on the avoidance of plagiarism. In this particular work setting, stress will be placed on the library visits because of the school's lack of an in-house library. Endeavors will be made to have at least two trips each year so students may have opportunity to achieve and practice good research procedures.

In addition, the writer has thoughts regarding an adaptation and broadening of the literary and moral studies section for use with students who have been taken out of class because of problem behaviors. The materials to be used would blend language arts and moral strategies to guide

students in dealing with their difficulties. The desired result would be for students to use language skills to help bring about changes in their behavior, thereby developing their skills while assuming some responsibility for their own behavior.

This practicum report will be made available to faculty and staff members of the school where it was implemented. In addition, the writer plans to share in a faculty meeting the underlying principle of dealing with moral issues in a subject-matter area. In whatever subject matter is being taught, there are related moral issues that can and probably should be broached. Ruggiero (1990) makes the point that integrating moral issues into the class does not distract but can add a new outlook to the subject. The aim is not that students solve major moral problems related to that field, but that they become aware of these issues, wrestle with them, and become excited about the subject area in a new way (casette recording). In this meeting, suggestions and instructions will be considered concerning the use of Socratic discussion and Ruggiero's strategy for decision making in moral issues.

The writer would also like to compose a journal article from this practicum report. This article would include documentation necessary for reporting, but the emphasis would be on a practical, how-to article for classroom teachers who already know that the problem exists.

On a broader scale, the writer considers the practicum a possible base for future investigation and dissemination of resulting work in the area of moral education. The personal interest that led to the choice of this subject was derived from a continuing concern. This interest is viewed by the writer as a potential for future career development in areas such as consultation. The interest, therefore, includes a desire to find additional ways to utilize parts of the solution and incorporate them with related methods in order to help young people meet the very real challenges they currently face in choosing right over wrong. Making teachers and youth workers aware of the seriousness of the need and sharing ways of doing something about that need would be greatly rewarding.

The planning and implementation of this practicum itself, as well as these plans for the use and dissemination of it, are all endeavors to get the results discussed by Delattre (1990),

> It is, after all, possible to train and habituate the young with respect, generosity of spirit, and intellectual honesty. It is possible to help the young learn habits of integrity without "imposition" and it is possible to teach them and help them learn to think with real acumen and rigor (p.44).

In the view of the writer of this report, as an educator, this endeavor is absolutely necessary. Christenson (1981) expresses this concern; "Our educational forefathers knew, as we must know when we think about it, that unless the educated are guided by sound values, education can be more curse than blessing" (p.37).

References

Bauer, G. (1986, Fall). The moral of the story. Policy Review, pp. 24-27.

Bennett, W. J. (1988, July). Moral literacy and formation of character. USA Today, pp. 84-87.

Brandt, A. (1990, October). Judgment calls. Parenting, pp. 112-121.

Character Education Institute. (1989). Decisions about me. San Antonio, Texas: Author.

Christenson, R. M. (1981, April 10). Clarifying 'values clarification' for the innocent. Christianity Today, pp. 36-39.

Cooper, J. W. (1990, August). Should public schools be teaching morality? South Dade Leader.

Delattre, E. J. (1990, September 5). Teaching integrity: The boundaries of moral education. Education Week, pp. 56,44.

Duska, R., & Whelan, M. (1975). Moral development: A guide to Piaget and Kohlberg. New York: Paulist Press.

Edwards, O. (1990, November). Doing the right thing. Special Report, pp. 8-9.

Engeler, A. (1990, November). Should schools teach goodness? Special Report, pp. 32-36.

Factor, H. S., McKeen, W., & Morris, Jon. (1990). Students' ethics require new ways to cope with cheating. Journalism Educator, 44, 57-59.

Fogg, R. (1976). Discouraging cheating. The Clearing House, 49, 329-331.

Gaddy, J. R., & Kelly, L. E. (1981). The good, the bad, and the ethics education. The Clearing House, 55(2), 65-66.

Gagne, Robert M., & Glaser, Robert. (1987). Foundations in learning research. In Robert M. Gagne (Ed.), Instructional Technology: Foundations (p.52). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gow, K. M. (1985). Yes, Virginia, there is right and wrong. Wheaton, Illinois: Tyndale House.

Greer, P. R., & Ryan, K. (1989). How to answer the hard questions about moral education. The American School Board Journal, 26-28.

Hammond, P. (1989, September 3). Teachers discover Aristotle has insights into Granite State ethics. New Hampshire Sunday News, pp. 5-6.

Harmin, M. (1990). How to plan a program for moral education. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.

Hechinger, F. M. (1990, September 27). Do society's moral standards teach wrong lessons to kids? The Miami Herald, pp. 1-2.

Houston, J. P. (1986). Classroom answer copying: Roles of acquaintanceship and free versus assigned seating. Journal of Educational Psychology, 78(3), 230-232.

It's status quo vs. change in District 7 school race. (1990, October 18). The Miami Herald, p.6.

Kirshenbaum, H., & Simon, S. B. (1969). Teaching English with a focus on values. English Journal, 58(7), 1071-1076, 1113.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). The philosophy of moral development: Moral stages and the idea of justice. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Kurtines, W. H., & Gewirtz, J. L. (Eds.). (1984). Morality, moral behavior, and moral development. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Lipman, M., Sharp., A. M., & Oscanyan, F. S. (1980). Philosophy in the classroom. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Manning, R. (Speaker). (1990). Workshop on dilemmas, role playing and simulation in moral education (Cassette Recording No. 256). Rohnert Park, California: Foundation for Critical Thinking.

Markman, Roberta H., Markman, Peter T., & Waddell, Marie L. (1989). 10 steps in writing the research paper. New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc.

McLaughlin, R. D., & Ross, S. M. (1989). Student cheating in high school: A case of moral reasoning vs. "fuzzy logic." The High School Journal, 72(3), 97-104.

Menninger, K. (1973). Whatever became of sin? New York: Hawthorn Books.

Molnar, A. (1990, November). Judging the ethics of ethics education. Educational Leadership, pp. 73-74.

Moss, B. (1984). Notes on cheating for the busy classroom teacher. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED243203)

Nazario, S. L. (1990). Schoolteachers say it's wrongheaded to try to teach students what's right. The Wall Street Journal, pp. 1-2.

Parks, J., & Barron, R. W. (1977). Can morality be taught? In L. J. Stiles & B. D. Johnson (Eds.), Morality examined/guidelines for teachers (pp. 3-24). New Jersey: Princeton Book Company.

Radest, Howard. (1989). Can we teach ethics? New York: Praeger.

Raffeto, W. G. (1985, October/November). The Cheat. Community, Technical and Junior College, pp. 26-27.

Rodkin, D. (1990, November 17). Office Perks. The Stuart News.

Ruggiero, V. R. (Speaker). (1990). Teaching ethics across the curriculum: A critical thinking approach (Cassette Recording No. 622). Rohnert Park, California: Foundation for Critical Thinking.

Ryan, K., & Greer, P. (1989). Something is not out there. Action in Teacher Education, XI(1), 11-15.

Saunders, M. A. (1986). The fail-safe micro research paper. Washington, D.C.: Washington Area Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED274202)

Schab, F. (1980). Cheating in high school: Differences between the sexes (revisited). Adolescence, XV(60), 959-965.

Simon, S., & Massey, S. (1973, May). Value clarification. Educational Leadership, 738-739.

Stanwyck, D. J., & Abdelal, P. (1984). Attitudes toward cheating behavior in the ESL classroom. West Palm Beach, Florida: Eastern Educational Research Association.

Stiles, L. J., & Johnson, B. D. (1977). Morality examined/ guidelines for teachers. New Jersey: Princeton Book Company.

Tests and Measurements in Child Development: Handbook II, (Vol. 2). (1976). London: Jossey-Bass.

Ward, G. (1988). I've got a project on .... Rozelle, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRES

SURVEY DIRECTIONS

Teachers, this is a questionnaire for a graduate research project. Please have your first period students complete it today, Tuesday, November 20. It is important to the project that all students do it during this same period. Please follow the directions below to provide uniformity and a feeling of privacy in order to get the most accurate responses possible.

DIRECTIONS:

Please have students use a sheet of paper to cover their answers as they write to insure privacy. Please do not walk around the room for the same reason. Students need to feel free to express their ideas privately.

Please read these directions to students as an introduction:

"This survey is part of a research project being done by a graduate student. Look at your paper and follow as I read the directions: 'NO NAMES, PLEASE. It will be very helpful if you will mark your answers according to what you have really done or seen or what you believe. This is just a survey, and no one will try to connect your answers with you for any reason. Make sure you understand each question before answering. Thank you for your help.' Notice that there are 5 headings-A, B, C, D, E. Each is different. Look at the headings now. On page 1, A says Have you ever--Please circle an answer according to your own experience. On page 2, B says Have you ever seen another person---do these things? C says In your opinion, is it wrong to---. Your opinion is desired; circle according to what you think. Think about each one because they are different. On page 3, D says In your opinion, is it O,K. to---. Again, circle what you think. On the last page, E asks you to write answers to 4 questions. Be sure to pay attention to these headings as you go through the questions. Please read carefully; some questions are similiar but not exactly the same. Go ahead. Turn your paper over when you're finished."

Please collect papers after all are finished. Record absences on this paper and return everything to Ms. Rankin.

Thank you for your cooperation.

SURVEY
(students)

No names, please.

It will be very helpful if you will mark your answers according to what you have <u>really</u> done or seen or what you believe. This is just a survey, and no one will try to connect your answers with you for any reason. Make sure you understand each question before answering. Thank you for your help.

A. Have you ever---

1. copied someone's homework and handed it in?	yes	no
2. let someone else copy your homework?	yes	no
3. had someone write your homework for you?	yes	no
4. had someone write a paper for you?	yes	no
5. copied someone's classwork and handed it in?	yes	no
6. looked at someone's work in class to get answers?	yes	no
7. looked at someone's test for answers?	yes	no
8. asked another student for answers during a test?	yes	no
9. looked at the teacher's answer sheet before or during a test?	yes	no
10. used hidden notes in taking a test?	yes	no
11. written answers on your hand for a test?	yes	no
12. gotten answers from a person who has already taken the test?	yes	no
13. used the teacher's answer book to do your work?	yes	no
14. copied information for a report from an encyclopedia without giving credit to the author?	yes	no
15. copied information from other sources without giving credit?	yes	no
16. handed in a report written originally by another person?	yes	no

17. handed in a report which you previously handed in for another class, without permission to do so? yes no

B. Have you ever seen another person---

18. copying someone else's homework? yes no
19. copying someone else's work in class? yes no
20. asking someone else to do their work for them? yes no
21. writing homework or a paper for another person to hand in? yes no
22. cheating on a test? yes no
23. using the teacher's answers to do his work? yes no
24. handing in a report as his own that he had not written himself? yes no

C. In your opinion, is it wrong to---

25. copy someone else's homework or classwork once in a while? yes no
26. ask your parents for help on homework? yes no
27. let a friend copy your homework? yes no
28. look at your notes for help on homework or classwork? yes no
29. ask the teacher for help? yes no
30. have someone do work for you to hand in-if you can't possibly do it? yes no
31. look at someone's test for answers? yes no
32. copy just one or two answers from someone else if you know most of the answers? yes no
33. ask the teacher if you need help during a test? yes no
34. use hidden notes for only a few answers while taking a test? yes no
35, ask another student for a test answer? yes no

36. give an answer to someone if he asks you for help? yes no
37. ask the teacher to interpret a test question? yes no
38. look at the teacher's answer key if it's been left lying around? yes no
39. get answers from a student who has already taken the test? yes no
40. copy on a test if no one sees you? yes no
41. use an encyclopedia for research for a report? yes no
42. copy information for a report without giving credit? yes no
43. rewrite the same information in your own words without giving credit? yes no

D. In your opinion, is it O.K. to---

44. study with a friend for a test? yes no
45. take hidden notes to a test just in case you forget an answer? yes no
46. copy one or two answers if you know almost all the answers yourself? yes no
47. copy on a test if the teacher is careless about watching the class? yes no
48. copy on a test if the teacher doesn't seem to care? yes no
49. copy on a test if other students are? yes no
50. copy if the test is on material that the teacher didn't cover? yes no
51. copy if the test seems unfair? yes no
52. copy if the test is too hard? yes no
53. copy if you are careful not to get caught? yes no
54. copy if you don't mind getting caught? yes no
55. copy someone's homework if you've been sick and missed class? yes no
56. copy homework if you had no time to do it? yes no

57. explain the lesson to a person who has been absent? yes no

58. let someone copy your homework if that person doesn't understand the lesson? yes no

59. let someone copy your homework if that person has been absent? yes no

60. let someone copy your homework if that person works at night and had no time to do the work? yes no

E. Please answer according to what is asked.

1. What additional things do you consider to be cheating?

2. How many students at this school do you think cheat? (Check one answer.)
_____none _____many
_____a few _____most
_____all

3. How serious do you consider it to be if students do cheat?

4. What do you feel would be a good solution to the problem of cheating in schools?

SURVEY
(Teachers)

It would be very helpful if you would answer these questions as a part of the survey being done with the students. Please answer in relation to your experiences in this school. Thank you for your help.

A. Have you seen students---

1. copying someone else's homework?	yes	no
2. copying someone else's work in class?	yes	no
3. asking someone for his work to copy?	yes	no
4. using crib notes during a test?	yes	no
5. possessing crib notes during a test?	yes	no
6. looking at another student's test paper?	yes	no
7. asking another student for an answer?	yes	no
8. looking at or using a teacher's answer key?	yes	no
9. asking students who have already taken a test for answers?	yes	no

B. Have you found out later by some method that one or more students had---

10. copied classwork or homework?	yes	no
11. copied test answers?	yes	no
12. used crib notes in a test?	yes	no
13. handed in a paper prepared by someone else?	yes	no
14. received answers from another student who had previously taken the test?	yes	no
15. copied parts of a report from the encyclopedia without giving credit to the author?	yes	no
16, copied other sources without giving credit?	yes	no
17. borrowed ideas and information from an author without giving credit?	yes	no
18. handed in a report done by someone else?	yes	no

C. Have you heard a student explain that he wasn't really cheating because---

19. the other person gave him the homework?	yes	no

20. the other person said that it was O.K. for him to copy the homework? yes no
21. he had been absent and unable to get the work? yes no
22, he didn't understand the work? yes no
23. he had not had time to do the homework? yes no
24. the teacher doesn't care if he gets help? yes no
25. the test was too hard? yes no
26. the test was unfair? yes no
27. the class hadn't covered all that material? yes no
28. of any other reason? (Please list.)

D. Because of cheating, have you ever---

29. given a student a lower grade on homework or classwork? yes no
30. given a student a failing grade on homework or classwork? yes no
31. given a student a lower grade on a test? yes no
32. given a student a failing grade on a test? yes no
33. given a student a failing grade for handing in a report done by someone else? yes no
34. given a student a lower grade for plagiarism? yes no
35. given a student a failing grade for plagiarism? yes no
36. given other academic reprisals? yes no
37. used some type of punitive discipline other than academic? yes no

E.Please answer each question carefully.

38. Do you consider copying homework or classwork to be cheating? yes no
39. Do you consider that the person who lets someone copy his homework is cheating? yes no
40. Do you consider copying on a test cheating? yes no

41. Do you feel that cheating is wrong? yes no
42. Do you think that the students in this school consider cheating to be wrong? yes no
43. Do you feel the students in this school understand the right and wrong in this matter? yes no
44. Do you feel that the students at this school in general care about the right and wrong in such issues? yes no
45. What additional things do you consider to be cheating?

46. How many students do you think cheat at this shcool?
_____none _____a few _____many _____most _____all
47. How serious do you consider it to be if students do cheat?

48. What do you feel would be a good solution to the problem of cheating in schools?

49. Any other comments?

APPENDIX B

ATTITUDE TOWARD CHEATING SCALE

TABLE 1

The 15 Items of the ATCS

1. Any reward I can think of for cheating on a test would not be worth the risk of getting caught. (-)*
2. Cheating on a test may sometimes be justifiable when the instructor fails to give the class any notice that they are to be tested. (+)
3. Cheating on a test, in the long run, increases a student's chances of success. (+)
4. Students who cheat on a test should be failed in the course. (-)
5. Cheating on a test may sometimes be justifiable when the instructor fails to get his subject across to the students. (+)
6. A student who cheats on a test should be subject to severe disciplinary action. (-)
7. Cheating on a test may sometimes be justifiable when the instructor is a very hard grader. (+)
8. A student who cheats on a test hasn't done anything exceptionally bad. (+)
9. Cheating on a test is a very serious offense. (-)
10. There is no point to cheating on a test. (-)
11. Cheating on a test may sometimes be justifiable when most of the other students are cheating. (+)

APPENDIX C

PRE/POSTTEST

Opinion Survey

Please indicate your opinion and feelings by responding to each item according to the 6-point scale, strongly agree, agree, slightly agree, slightly disagree, disagree, strongly disagree; coded +3, +2, +1, -1, -2, and -3, respectively. It will be very helpful if your answers show your true feelings as closely as possible.

PART A

		+3	+2	+1	-1	-2	-3
−	1. Any reward I can think of for cheating on a test would not be worth the risk of getting caught.						
+	2. Cheating on a test may sometimes be justifiable when the instructor fails to give the class any notice that thay are to be tested.						
+	3. Cheating on a test, in the long run, increases a student's chances of success.						
+	4. Cheating on a test may sometimes be justifiable when the instructor fails to get his subject across to the students.						
−	5. A student who cheats on a test should be subject to severe disciplinary action.						
+	6. Cheating on a test may sometimes be justifiable when the instructor is a very hard grader.						
+	7. A student who cheats on a test hasn't done anything exceptionally bad.						
−	8. Cheating on a test is a very serious offense.						
−	9. There is no point to cheating on a test.						
+	10. Cheating on a test may sometimes be justifiable when most of the other students are cheating.						

		+3	+2	+1	-1	-2	-3
+	11. Cheating on a test may sometimes be justifiable when a test is given which is just too difficult.						
−	12. There are no circumstances under which it would be worthwhile to cheat on a test.						
+	13. Circumstances may sometimes almost force a student to cheat on a test.						
+	14. It is sometimes worthwhile to cheat on a test.						
−	15. A student who cheats on a test should receive a failing grade on the test.						
+	16. It is all right for a student to copy another student's homework if it only happens occasionally.						
−	17. If a student is asked for help during a test, it is wrong for him to give an answer.						
+	18. It is OK for a student to allow a friend to copy homework when the friend is really in need of it.						
+	19. Copying information from an encyclopedia or another book is a necessary part of writing a report.						
+	20. It would be acceptable for a student to copy one or two answers if he knew the rest himself.						
+	21. It is all right to allow another student to copy homework if that person has been absent.						
−	22. Copying information for a report without giving credit to the author is cheating.						
+	23. It is not too bad for a student to use hidden notes for only a few answers during a test.						

	+3	+2	+1	-1	-2	-3
+ 24. Getting answers from a student who has previously taken the test is sensible, not wrong.						

PART B

1. Explain what plagiarism is.

2. What procedure can be followed to make sure plagiarism is avoided?

3. In making decisions regarding matters of right and wrong, do you use or know any strategy or plan?

YES NO

4. If you have a strategy for such decision making, list the steps in it.

5. If you can, list two principles (basic facts or rules) that actually influence your thinking when choosing a course of action.